

**Responses to Comments on Draft FY 2009 NPM Guidance  
Office of Air & Radiation**

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
<b>Air Quality Management</b>				
EPA should renew its efforts to partner with local and state agencies to plan a comprehensive program of air quality management for the nation. Local and state agencies stand ready to engage with EPA in substantive planning to meet future air quality requirements and improve the health of the nation's citizenry and the quality of the nation's environment.	Metro 4- SESARM	OAR is working with several States to pilot the development of comprehensive air quality management plans. We look forward to sharing the results of the pilots upon their completion and working together with State and local agencies to determine how best to move forward in replicating the findings of the pilots in other areas.	N	None
<b>NAAQS</b>				
EPA should accelerate issuance of program-specific guidance necessary to develop state implementation plans. Our agencies continue to be hamstrung by late guidance and expectations for which there is little time to react before regulatory deadlines.	Metro 4- SESARM	OAR is committed to issuing quality guidance to assist State and local agencies in meeting their obligations for state implementation plans. OAR strives to ensure that this guidance is as timely as possible however, some delays are beyond EPA's control.	N	None
Transport continues to be a significant issue in the Northeast and will be come even more important with the new NAAQS standards. EPA needs to fulfill its obligations and promulgate long anticipated PM <sub>2.5</sub> implementation guidance and timely guidance on the new ozone standard; to fulfill its commitment to promulgate national emission control rules (e.g., paints and consumer products); and to work expeditiously on developing and promulgating additional national control programs (e.g., ICI boilers, a third phase of CAIR, etc.) and modeling techniques that recognize High Electric Demand Day Emissions in ozone attainment modeling. Equally important is EPA's funding for expanded data collection, given a longer ozone season, and for the planning and implementation of new state and regional programs.	New England States	OAR is committed to fulfilling its obligations to promulgated all standards required by the Clean Air Act. There is a schedule for completing the NAAQS reviews and standards that are under court order.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
EPA needs to continue to adopt and expeditiously implement strategies to reduce particulate matter and diesel emissions.	New England States	EPA recently announced the availability of almost \$50 million in grant funding to establish clean diesel projects aimed at reducing emissions from the nation's existing fleet of diesel engines. We believe this effort will significantly increase efforts to reduce diesel emissions. EPA has set stringent new particulate and nitrogen oxide standards for most types of new engines. These regulations will annually prevent more than 20,000 premature deaths and yield more than \$150 billion in public health benefits when fully implemented. This \$50 million in new funding, however, is aimed at reducing emissions from the existing fleet of 11 million diesel engines that pre-date these standards. Addressing the existing fleet is important because diesels remain in use for decades.	N	None
What is the 8-hour Ozone Flex program?	Region 5	Announced in June 2001, 8-hour Ozone Flex was a one-time opportunity for areas that were attaining the 1-hour ozone standard to achieve emission reductions and avoid future nonattainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS. See <a href="http://www.epa.gov/ttn/oarpg/t1/memoranda/o3flexguidelines.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/ttn/oarpg/t1/memoranda/o3flexguidelines.pdf</a>	N	None
<b>Monitoring</b>				
NACAA does not agree that there are an adequate number of monitoring sites nationally to support the existing NAAQS program. This is particularly true for ozone where a new, tighter standard has been proposed and where many areas will need to ascertain their compliance status.	National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA)	The network design criteria for ozone is appropriate to implement the more protective ozone NAAQS. However, with a more protective NAAQS, the minimum monitoring requirements leave some areas - especially those with low populations - with little or no characterization of ozone. EPA is working towards a proposal to revise the minimum monitoring requirements for ozone later this year.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
We strongly encourage EPA to restore the Part 75 Mercury Monitoring Provisions of the Clean Air Mercury Rule, which provides the technical basis and requirements for Continuous Emission Monitoring (CEM) and Sorbent Traps as methods for measuring in-stack mercury emissions.	New England States	On February 8, 2008, the D.C. Circuit vacated the Clean Air Mercury Rule. EPA is reviewing the Court's decisions and evaluating its impacts.	N	None
<b>Air Toxics</b>				
Several commentors expressed concerns related to the emphasis on implementing programs in areas experiencing disproportionate impacts.	Regions 5 & 6	OAR is continuing to work with the Regions and Office of Environmental Justice on how to define an area with disproportionate impacts.	N	None
Pages 12 and 13, Federal Stationary Source Regulations section. In July, the Commercial and Industrial Waste Incinerators rule was vacated and the definitions of acceptable fuel in the wood-fired boiler MACT were remanded. Does OAR plan to re-write those rules this year or leave that to a future year? Additionally the Other Solid Waste Incinerator rule was remanded recently -- will OAR be addressing that this year or in the future?	Region 5	The vacature of the CISWI rule definition affects both the major and area source Boiler rules. Both were needed to satisfy our obligations to regulate 90% of PBT emissions under section 112(c)(6), which was under a consent decree for completion 12/2007. We have been granted extensions from the court to negotiate with the litigants on these deadlines and the current deadline is 05/31/08. OSWI is also involved in the negotiations with litigants, so we do not have a schedule for these to date either.	N	None
Page 26. One of the strategies for federal support for air toxics programs includes "Innovative approaches in addition to regulatory efforts that will achieve emission reductions. These approaches include, but are not limited to, woodstove changeout programs that reduce indoor and ambient exposure to air toxics, emission reductions from the existing diesel fleet not subject to new emission standards, and a collision repair campaign to reduce air toxics emissions from the auto body repair industry."  Region 5 would like any commitments or reporting to be flexible as each geographic area will have unique concerns to address which in turn, will dictate the types of innovative/voluntary approaches implemented.	Region 5	The are no commitments associated with these programs in FY 2009.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
On page 28, under Regions, add "as needs indicate and resources allow" at the end of the statement that reads "Provide training to with S/L/Ts on air toxics program requirements." and add "as resources allow" to the end of the statement that reads "Work with HQ to implement the Sustainable Skylines Initiative by providing support to cities under the initiative."	Region 6	Agree	Y	Language revised.
<p>Page 28, Air Toxics Implementation – Priorities for FY 2009 section, Regions subsection. The Regional Implementation Priorities for FY2009 include: "Work with S/L/Ts to implement their risk-based air toxics program. Specifically, assist S/L/Ts to: 1) implement a residual risk program, and 2) assess and address the combined impact of multiple sources of air toxics, encouraging voluntary reductions of air toxics from indoor and outdoor sources, as appropriate."</p> <p>Decreasing funding is making this element increasingly difficult to accomplish. Although most of our states have the capacity, they lack the resources to fully participate and implement a risk-based program.</p>	Region 5	We appreciate the resource constraints facing all of our regulatory partners. Many States have different approaches to addressing air toxics issues. We want to encourage all approaches that States choose that will get us closer to attaining the goals stated in the Clean Air Act.	N	None
<p>Page 36, Air Toxics – Priorities for FY 2009 section, State activities include: "Work with communities to develop and implement voluntary air toxics programs that address outdoor, indoor, and mobile sources with emphasis on areas with potential environmental justice concerns."</p> <p>Comment: Decreasing funding is making this element increasingly difficult to accomplish. Although, most of our states have the capacity, they lack the resources to fully participate and implement a risk-based program.</p>	Region 5	These are voluntary programs and should be considered as resources permit.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
<b>Mercury</b>				
<p>We strongly encourage EPA's compliance with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit ruling relating to the Clean Air Mercury Rule by promptly drafting new rules for significant reduction of mercury emissions from coal fired power plants.</p> <p>We want EPA to pursue new rules and strengthen existing emission control rules to significantly and quickly reduce mercury deposition in the Northeast.</p> <p>We strongly encourage EPA to restore the Part 75 Mercury Monitoring Provisions of the Clean Air Mercury Rule, which provides the technical basis and requirements for Continuous Emission Monitoring (CEM) and Sorbent Traps as methods for measuring in-stack mercury emissions.</p>	New England States	<p>On February 8, 2008, the D.C. Circuit vacated EPA's rule removing power plants from the Clean Air Act list of sources of hazardous air pollutants. At the same time, the Court vacated the Clean Air Mercury Rule. EPA is reviewing the Court's decisions and evaluating its impacts.</p> <p>To meet critical atmospheric mercury data needs, EPA is collaborating with the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) membership of federal agencies, states, tribes, academic institutions, and others to establish a new, coordinated network for monitoring atmospheric mercury species. The network will measure air concentrations of mercury in its gaseous and particulate forms, event-based mercury wet deposition, and meteorological and land-cover variables needed for estimating dry deposition.</p> <p>At present, 10 speciated ambient mercury monitoring stations are participating in NADP to provide high resolution, high quality, speciated ambient concentration data needed to estimate dry deposition, conduct source apportionment analyses, and evaluate atmospheric mercury models.</p>	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
<b>Tribal Program</b>				
To better understand the number of tribes that are expected to obtain TAS approval by 2011, as indicated in the OAR Guidance, the NTAA requests that the EPA provide our organization with a clear rationale as to how the number was arrived at. With a better understanding, the NTAA can then communicate our understanding to and work with the tribes that expect to achieve TAS status in the next few years.	National Tribal Air Association (NTAA)	The estimate of the number of tribes expected to obtain TAS approvals by 2011 is established by working closely with Regional Tribal Air Program Offices and staff, relying on their close relationships with tribal air program staff throughout the nation. The Regional Offices provide input on where tribes in each Region are in developing their programs and what their plans or for the future. While some changes in those plans are inherent, this number is the collective best informed estimate based on Regional Office knowledge of tribal planning.	N	None
As one of its regional priorities for the national ambient air quality standards in FY 2009 (see page 19), the EPA plans to “work with states to encourage and support innovative and voluntary emission reduction projects” such as wood stove changeout programs. For some time now, the NTAA has been working closely with the EPA and Hearth, Patio & Barbeque Association to bring similar projects to Indian lands – i.e., wood stove changeout programs. Our organization would therefore strongly recommend that tribes are placed alongside states in the OAR Guidance as the types of governments for which the Agency’s regional offices will be working closely with on innovative and voluntary emission reduction projects.	NTAA	OAR apologizes for this oversight and thanks the NTAA for pointing out this error. OAR is dedicated to continuing appropriate relationships with tribal governments and complying with all policies respecting tribal sovereignty and the government-to-government relationship between the federal government and federally recognized tribes. OAR is fully supportive of tribal woodstove changeouts, as evidenced by projects already undertaken in Indian country, such as with the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community in Region 10. The passage has been reworded.	Y	Language revised to read “work with states and tribes to encourage and support innovative and voluntary emission reduction projects.”

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
NTAA recommends that statistics be conveyed through better specificity. As an example, the OAR indicates that there are approximately 150 air quality monitors operating in Indian country, but there is no breakdown as to the location of these monitors nor their types (e.g., mercury, IMPROVE, CASTNET). Identifying their present locations within this OAR Guidance document would help the EPA better understand where data gaps still exist for such monitoring and subsequently help the Agency on where it should focus its attention in filling these gaps.	NTAA	OAR appreciates NTAA's comments on air quality monitors, and will provide NTAA with a list of monitors and their locations in Indian country directly. OAR and OAQPS have in the past, and continue to devote significant resources to ensuring all monitoring networks are operated in the most meaningful and efficient manner possible, and welcomes NTAA's participation in those efforts.	N	None
How will OAR's plans to provide meaningful notice and access to tribes for participation in rule or program development (pg 40) in the form of government-to-government consultation between the EPA and tribes be integrated into EPA's proposed guidance for carrying out Executive Order (EO) 131375? And without such guidance, how will the EPA proceed forward in providing meaningful government-to-government consultation? At minimum, NTAA recommends that OAR develop interim guidance, in the absence of EO 13175 guidance, to carry out meaningful government-to-government consultation. Furthermore, NTAA recommends that OAR commit additional resources beyond those required as part of the prospective EO 13175 or interim guidance. Specifically, NTAA asks that for each rule or program development, OAR hold regular conference calls, public meetings distributed both regionally and fairly in accordance with tribal expectations, etc. NTAA recommends that this be included as part of the prospective Guidance document.	NTAA	OAR is committed to working closely with our tribal partners and carrying out consultation as appropriate. We are developing guidance to assist our Offices in conducting consultation, and that document will be instrumental in developing a full policy that comports with the requirements being developed by AIEO under EO 13175. OAR has been working internally and with Regional Offices to ensure that outreach is taking place to support consultation and ensure tribal awareness of Air Program activities, including providing appropriate opportunities for consultation on rules such as the mandatory greenhouse gas reporting rule to be proposed in FY08. We have also revised the guidance to clarify our commitment to supporting consultation.	Y	Language revised.
NTAA strongly recommends that the OAR establish a tribal set-aside fund, be it through EPA discretionary funds or some other means, to allow tribes to continue their involvement in the RPO process and to help advance tribal issues and concerns.	NTAA	The President's budget request for FY09 does not include funding for RPOs.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
OAR Guidance refers to a tribal database on pages 40 and 41 without explanation as to what this database is or its intended purpose. The NTAA would therefore appreciate additional information regarding the database so we, as an organization, can provide specific input about it if necessary.	NTAA	The OAR Tribal Database is an internal tracking mechanism designed to allow OAR to better report tribal accomplishments to various internal planning and tracking systems such as those required under the Government Performance Results Act of 1993 and OMB's Performance Assessment Rating Tool. The data will also help measure and monitor tribal activities related to the Annual Commitments System, the Deputy Administrator's Quarterly Management Report, and the annual OAR Tribal STAG allocation.	N	None
NTAA recommends, as it did for the FY 2008 OAR Guidance, that a priority specific to international issues be added. A number of tribes, specifically those on the border of neighboring countries and those along coastal waters, are impacted by air pollutants both near and far away from their lands. As such, some effort on the part of the OAR to address these emissions would subsequently help to address tribal issues and concerns about the air quality over their respective lands.	NTAA	We have joined with other countries from North America, Europe, and Asia to form an expert task force that is working to better understand the nature and extent of intercontinental air pollution. Organized under the Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution, the task force is co-chaired by the U.S. and the European Community, and involves participants from more than 27 countries. We also cooperate with other countries under the Stockholm Convention on POPs to reduce the impacts of pesticides and persistent toxics, and under the UNEP Mercury Program to better characterize the sources, transport, and fate of mercury in the atmosphere and to reduce mercury releases. We also participate in the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate to accelerate the development and deployment of clean energy technologies, and in the Methane to Markets Partnership to advance cost-effective, near-term methane recovery and use as a clean energy source.	N	None



Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
NTAA recommends, as it did for the FY 2008 OAR Guidance, that EPA regions (specifically Regions 6 and 10), provide specific resource and technical assistance to Alaskan Native Villages and Oklahoma tribes in the form of Direct Implementation Tribal Cooperative Agreements (DITCAs). Because many of the Oklahoma tribes have been unable to receive TAS and only one Alaskan Native Village is currently eligible for TAS (e.g., Metlakatla Indian Community), DITCAs are a next best alternative for these tribes and villages to work under as a means to address issues and concerns related to their respective air quality.	NTAA	OAR and AIEO support and are implementing DITCA's to support tribal work where appropriate. Regional Offices currently fund three DITCA's with tribes and continue to support their further and continued use.	N	None
NTAA recommends that EPA regions work with tribes to provide them with the necessary resources to develop GHG emissions inventories.	NTAA	OAR is committed to providing all available resources to tribal governments to support their continued program development to address air quality concerns and maintain good air quality. EPA recently announced the preparation of an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to seek comment on the implications of regulating GHGs. OAR anticipates and encourages tribal participation in these and subsequent efforts to address GHG emissions.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
<b>Climate Change</b>				
Pages 55 to 58, Climate Change section. Comment: The FY09 Priorities for Regions predominantly focus on Energy Star and Smartway. We believe, however, that there are many other EPA Climate Change programs which lend themselves to Regional participation and presentation to businesses and state and municipal partners. While Green Power, methane partnership, and diesel programs are briefly mentioned, there are other programs including Climate Leaders, Combined Heat and Power, and electric utility outreach programs where Regional efforts can be successful. Expanding the Guidance to include these can support both existing and developing Regional programs to implement Climate Change priorities. Further, we encourage HQ to review further opportunities for Regional participation in this new and rapidly developing area.	Region 5	Agree. We have included additional climate change program in the Priorities for the Region section.	Y	Additional climate change programs added to Climate Change section.
Reducing greenhouse gases should continue to be a focal point of EPA and State air programs (e.g., the New England States' involvement in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative). As States implement greenhouse gas reduction efforts and regional cap and trade programs, the federal government needs to support state led efforts and consider developing similar programs modeled after these efforts.	New England States	EPA will continue to support state and local governments in their pursuit of GHG emissions reductions through its state and local programs such as the Clean Energy-Environment State Partnership, Clean Energy-Environment Municipal Network, and National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency. These programs offer state and local partners (including some Region 1 participants) technical assistance, tools and resources, peer exchange opportunities, and recognition as they develop individualized energy efficiency, clean energy, and GHG reduction goals and policies. Further, other EPA climate protection programs such as ENERGY STAR and the Combined Heat and Power Partnership will continue to provide tools, resources, and platforms to be leveraged by state and local governments to achieve their goals.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
<p>We want to see EPA collaboration with The Climate Registry (TCR) in developing the federal mandatory Greenhouse Gas reporting to ensure consistency with TCR protocols. (NE States)</p> <p>SESARM recommended that EPA use its expertise and resources to partner with local and state agencies to create an effective and efficient registry of greenhouse gases (baseline and annual changes) that meets local, state and national needs. The registry is necessary for a consolidated, comprehensive program and would serve as a key resource for businesses and agencies. (Metro 4-SESARM)</p>	New England States & Metro 4-SESARM	In developing the federal mandatory greenhouse gas reporting rule, we intend to work with The Climate Registry, with states that have mandatory reporting programs in place, and with other reporting programs. We are seeking to build on the methods from existing mandatory and voluntary reporting systems, as appropriate.	N	None
<p>Reducing greenhouse gas pollutants from motor vehicles is a major concern for the New England States. A national strategy to reduce such emissions from motor vehicles, including reconsideration of the denial of the California LEV waiver and from other sources is needed.</p>	New England States	<p>As explained in the Administrator's March 27, 2008 letter to Senators Boxer and Inhofe, the Agency will be issuing an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to considers the potential regulation of greenhouse gas emissions from stationary and mobile sources under the Clean Air Act. As of April 16, 2008, the Administrator's letter was available on-line at <a href="http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&amp;FileStore_id=48cc5c7d-56ef-426b-ba32-d027aad08eb6">http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&amp;FileStore_id=48cc5c7d-56ef-426b-ba32-d027aad08eb6</a> If desired, we can email you a copy of the letter.</p>	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
<b>Grants and Funding</b>				
Funding should be restored to support the Great Lakes Atmospheric Deposition Program (GLAD) which is not obsolete. The program focuses on the transport and deposition of that toxics air pollution in ecosystems and waterways under CAA §112(m) and not simply the monitoring of air toxics. Without GLAD, Michigan notes that it will no longer be able to focus on risks to humans and wildlife from critical PBT pollutants. GLAD also facilitates the coordination of Great Lakes states' programs dealing with toxic air emissions. Region 5 questioned why funding was completely eliminated for GLAD while other areas were only reduced.	Michigan DEQ, New York DEQ, Region 5	EPA understands the importance of the ongoing research, monitoring, and deposition work to the Great Lakes region. The reference to air toxics analyses should have been more specific to air toxics deposition analyses. However, given limited funds and competing priorities, EPA has chosen to no longer show dedicated funds for such activity in favor of increasing the amount of funds for direct award to state/local air quality agencies. These funds are now included in the total amount of air grant resources available for direct distribution to states and locals including those in the Great Lakes region. In working with EPA, agencies still have the flexibility to address their own AQ priorities, including air toxics transfer and deposition, using their available resources.	N	None
Funding level is inadequate to support the activities of state/local air quality agencies. Reductions from FY 2008 level will force staff reductions, curtail monitoring programs, impair inspection and enforcement efforts, increase permitting time for minor sources, diminish customer service, increase risks to sensitive populations, could return some programs to EPA, and jeopardize existence of some smaller local agencies. Budget request ignores current funding needs and fails to account for additional time-consuming and labor intensive demands that state/local air quality agencies will face: e.g., development of SIPs for haze and tightened PM2.5 and ozone standards; expanded monitoring needs; acceptance of delegation for implementation of standards for the control of HAPs from minor/area sources including inventories, compliance assistance and outreach, non-Title V permitting and enforcement activities.	Various commentors including NACAA, Michigan DEQ, City of Albuquerque, Metro 4-SESARM, & New England States	While the President has proposed reductions in state air grants to meet the administration's FY2009 budget objectives, Section 105 grant recipients do have discretion in how those reductions are handled. States also have the ability to utilize more flexible funding arrangements available to them like performance partnership grants. State and local agencies have latitude to make investment/disinvestment decisions for their air programs provided the necessary performance measures are met. Effective, joint strategic planning is critical to the continued success of the nation's air monitoring network when budgets must be limited to meet broader fiscal demands. EPA has, and will, provide national guidance to help state/local agencies make those strategic decisions at their level.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
Region 6 questioned whether a reference to tribal recipients and tribal PM2.5 activities should be included in the discussion of section 103 to section 105 funding transition for the PM2.5 air monitoring program.	Region 6	The reference was included to indicate that, in recognition of unique tribal funding provisions, OAR would also need to work closely with tribes in implementing PM2.5 program funding transition and maintaining tribal program operations. The language has been edited to refer to 'recipients' in general.	N	None
Some agencies will not be able to provide the increased resources necessary to meet the cost sharing requirements of Section 105 if the PM2.5 air monitoring program is moved under that authority. Other agencies are already overmatched and will choose not to provide increased recipient resources for the program.	Various commentors including NACAA, Michigan DEQ, City of Albuquerque, & Texas CEQ	EPA recognizes that State and local agencies make valuable contributions to the nation's air quality management system. Section 103 grants do not require a match; they are by statute designed for new research programs and not for sustained long-term efforts such as the PM monitoring program. The current form of the PM monitoring program was started after the 1997 review of the PM NAAQS. After 11 years of successful monitoring, EPA believes it is time to transition the program to the Section 105 authority that, by statute, is designed for long-term sustained efforts. It is understandable that State and local agencies are concerned about this transition, and EPA is committed to providing sustained technical assistance to the State and local agencies in this area.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
<p>NACAA commented that EPA's reduced funding and distribution rationale in the areas of NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO and Pb is based on a faulty premise. NO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> are precursors to fine particulates and it is important for many areas to continue to address them. For areas where these problems have been ameliorated, agencies had already shifted available funds into higher priority areas. EPA is currently developing a revised allocation formula so it would be premature to distribute FY 2009 funds according to reductions via the 4-pollutant approach. Rather, a pro-rata approach, based on FY 2006 results, should be used for FY 2009 (NACAA). Region 5 recommended that FY 2008 percentages be used in FY 2009 to better maintain equity. Region 6 argued that EPA needed to be more explicit in identifying what could not be done given reduced funding and that this would be more consistent with the Agency's ongoing concern with being more accountable with funds received.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>	<p>NACAA &amp; Metro 4-SESARM</p>	<p>EPA's revision of funds targeted to the pollutant areas of NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO and Pb was based upon a consideration of attainment status, monitoring priorities, and information from Regions and recipients on how grant funds were being targeted. EPA recognizes the need to continue operating some of the existing NO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> monitoring stations as it does other NAAQS pollutants. These needs are identified and updated yearly as part of each State's annual monitoring network plan, which is approved by the applicable EPA Regional Office. Each State is also required to develop a comprehensive assessment of its air quality surveillance system every five years with the first formal assessment required in July of 2010. By this date, EPA will also have completed a recent (within a five year period) review of each NAAQS. CO, the exception, is expected in 2012.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>SESARM pointed to the increased growth in its region of the country and urged EPA to complete and phase-in an updated allocation formula whether or not funding increases were expected. (Metro 4-SESARM). These funds should go to base programs.</p>		<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>Each NAAQS review process will likely end with a final rulemaking which, among other things, is expected to identify the network design criteria to support the NAAQS. In the interim, reflecting input from Regions and recipients on the equitable distribution of funds, EPA has adjusted the region-by-region percentages used to distribute FY2008 and FY2009 air grants. OAR is nearing the completion of its internal process for reexamination of the allocation rationale and soon expects to again engage states, locals and tribes on an implementation strategy. Any revisions would not take effect until at least 2010.</p>		

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
<p>There are several areas in the guidance that are not consistent with the Agency's stated policy to seek the prior consultation of its partners on the allocation and use of grant resources. In particular, funds were moved from Regional Haze Planning Organizations (RPOs), and the Great Lakes and US-Mexico Border air quality programs to fund a vaguely-defined Air Quality and Energy Development initiative without prior consultation. Also targeting funds for such an initiative is inopportune given the proposed cuts to already strained state/local programs. These funds should go to base programs.</p>	NACAA	<p>Adjustments and reductions made in US-Mexico Border, Great Lakes, and RPO funding were done to increase the total amount of funds available for direct award to state/locals in the President's budget request given the overall reduction in funds. The Regional Energy-Air Quality Initiative for states/locals (\$3.9M) was a separate initiative for FY 2009. The funds are in addition to the \$2.3M increase requested for tribes. The funds are intended to assist states, locals, and tribes in carrying out expected increases in responsibilities and workload generated by the provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>	N	None
		<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>Funds were redirected from the US-Mexico Border program to reflect the assumption of increased monitoring responsibility for a portion of the cross-border network by Mexico.</p> <p>Rather than continuing to target funds for Great Lakes air toxics deposition analysis work, funds were redirected to increase the total direct funds to states/local including Region 5 where those states can make individual decisions about their air investments. RPO status is addressed below.</p>		

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
Texas requests that further clarification be included in the guidance document on the relation between the anticipated 50% reduction in U.S.-Mexico Border funding and the transfer of ownership of cross-border monitoring to Mexico and its relevance to Texas. Texas notes that only a very-small portion of cross-border monitoring occurs in the C. Juarez area and none of that monitoring has been transferred to Mexico.	Texas CEQ	The reduction in STAG funds will not reduce any of the bi-national monitoring efforts that Texas is currently carrying out along the US-Mexico border.	N	None
The Energy/Air Quality initiative is not well-defined in the guidance. The activities described are either EPA's responsibility (e.g., NEPA) or the responsibility of the energy project owner and should not be eligible to be funded with air STAG funds. States have not been consulted in advance for this and other off-the-tops like IMPROVE and CASTNET.	Michigan DEQ	<p>The energy/air quality initiative proposes additional resources for state, local, and tribal agencies to address the increased workloads expected in environmental review, intergovernmental consultation, air monitoring and modeling activity (prior to any permitting) caused by heightened energy facility development activity (i.e., oil and gas wells, LNG evaluations, clean carbon power plants, coal expansion, and renewable energy projects). The initiative is analogous to the approach the Agency took in working with recipients to prepare or ramp-up for implementation of the Title V operating permit program.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>	N	None



Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
		<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>The Agency did request comment as part of the draft national guidance and has consulted NACAA. As a result of that consultation, OAR has agreed to defer any distribution of the Energy Initiative funds until additional details are obtained and discussed with the states, locals and tribes. OAR also notes that there are no FY 2009 STAG funds targeted for CASTNET and that for numerous years IMPROVE monitoring has been carried out as direct implementation action under the CAA via an Interagency Agreement with the National Park Service.</p>		
<p>NACAA is concerned that eliminating funds for RPOs will deprive them of the tools needed to continue to provide haze support to states/locals and recommends that \$2.5 million continue to be targeted to RPOs. Michigan DEQ notes that states have used the RPOs' assistance for emission inventories, transport modeling, and control strategy analysis and that ending RPO support will hurt SIP efforts to meet new ozone, PM2.5 and Pb NAAQS. Several Tribes expressed support for the overall increase, and hopefully continued increases, in Tribal air funding but also expressed serious concern with the removal of dedicated funding for RPOs. The Tribes noted that, in the absence of funding for LADCO and other RPOs, they may lose a strong advocate to compel State, Local, and Tribal air quality managers to coordinate their regional haze air quality efforts. WESTAR and SESARM note that a basic infrastructure must be maintained and that much regional haze work still needs to be done.</p>	<p>Various commentors including NACAA, Michigan DEQ, NTAA, Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians, Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, Metro 4-SESARM, &amp; WESTAR, EPA Region 5, New England States</p>	<p>EPA recognizes that the RPOs have been instrumental in providing States and Tribes with the needed materials to prepare regional haze SIPs. These plans were due to EPA by 12/17/2007. Congress provided funds for RPOs for the express purpose of assisting states in preparing these SIPs. Congress has not authorized funds for a broadened RPO charge covering assistance in preparing other SIPs. Accordingly, the President's FY 2009 budget request does not include dedicated funding for RPO work. This reflects EPA's view that the future role of and funding for RPOs should be a matter of state discretion rather than an EPA determination.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
		<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>However, in addition to approximately \$4.5M in prior year funding being available, OAR has reached agreement with states and locals to provide an additional \$2.5M in FY 2008 to RPOs to provide additional residual technical support for regional haze. States may also provide their own resources to support the RPOs and can work with EPA to target more of the air grant funds they receive for RPO regional haze work.</p>		
<p>EPA should continue to fund NATTS but funds for local-scale air toxics monitoring should be moved to the base program given tough economic times. State/local agencies can make individual decisions to fund such monitoring out of funds allocated to them.</p>	NACAA	<p>In 2007, EPA conducted a competitive grant process to award funds for community-scale air toxics monitoring. Applicants were informed of their award in August 2007. In FY 2007, we did not fund any of the awards in order to restore funding to support State programs and in FY 2008 funding available for this program was further reduced at the request of NACAA. The process of applying for these competitive awards involves a significant investment of resources by State and local air agencies. By eliminating all funding to the community-scale air toxics monitoring, the significant investment by these agencies will be lost.</p>	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
NACAA believes that the \$2.3 million held off-the-top for the NOx/CAIR trading system should be paid for by EPA and administered in the same way as the Acid Rain program.	NACAA & Metro 4-SESARM	<p>The referenced Section 105 funds are used solely to support the CAIR <u>seasonal</u> NOx trading program for regional <u>ozone</u> control. Congress did not provide funding to EPA for the development and operation of the seasonal component of the CAIR program. EPA did not propose this portion of the final program; in fact, this component was added as a supplement to the annual control program in response to States' public comment. For this reason, no funding is taken from states, such as Georgia, that are affected under the <u>annual</u> CAIR program for regional control of <u>fine</u> particles, but are not affected for the seasonal program for regional ozone control.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>	N	None
		<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>Furthermore, Sec 105 funds are taken only from those states that have elected to participate in the EPA-administered interstate seasonal NOx allowance trading program. All states affected for CAIR seasonal program have elected to participate in the EPA-administered centralized trading program with the knowledge that these reductions would be made. The CAIR seasonal NOx allowance market functions separately from the CAIR annual NOx allowance market and trading program.</p>		

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
With reductions in overall funding, OAR should also consider reductions in associated program support areas of NACAA, CAA Training, IMPROVE, CAIR, and NPAP.	Region 5	Funding for two areas that Region 5 cites - CAA Training and NACAA, are determined in consultation with affected states/locals. The NOx-CAIR trading system is required for NOx SIP Implementation and costs are based on a per source cost. The system is periodically assessed to determine cost efficiencies in operation. The IAG NPS/DOI is dependent upon that portion of the IMPROVE funds measuring visibility in national parks and wilderness areas. IMPROVE costs, as part of PM2.5 monitoring, are subject to review as the size of the overall network changes. NPAP costs are related to the QA needs of the operating network and as that is changed, NPAP QA costs can also change.	N	None
Associated program support costs for the PM2.5 monitoring program should be reduced to reflect the size of the network. States/locals agreed to support these costs when there was sufficient funding but, given the proposed reductions, EPA should now support these costs.	NACAA	EPA believes the existing PM2.5 monitoring network is adequate to support the intended level of protection of the NAAQS. EPA does not have any plans to reduce the size of the network.	N	None
Several commentors underscored the necessity and importance of CAA-related training for the effectiveness of state/local air programs. NACAA continues to recommend that EPA fund training from its own budget but has agreed that States and locals should match EPA expenditures until transition to full EPA funding. NACAA and SESARM both continue to recommend that EPA hold \$2 million off-the-top to support state/local agency training. SESARM noted that EPA should match this level and share its training plan for federal employees with NACAA's Joint Training Committee and partner with that organization and all state/local agencies to provide needed funding and supporting resources to revitalize training.	NACAA	EPA recognizes the importance of the CAA training program. EPA provides a significant level of support to the training program beyond the STAG resources. Budget constraints prevent the possibility of full EPA funding.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
Numerous areas in the west have exceeded the 50K population level and are now subject to minimum federal PM2.5 monitoring requirements. EPA should address this issue and provide funding as appropriate.	NACAA	Areas between 50,000 and less than 500,000 are only required to monitor for PM2.5 if there is a design value that is greater than or equal to 85 percent of either the daily or annual NAAQS. EPA encourages agencies to evaluate the potential for being near or above a design value with special purpose monitors or PM2.5 continuous monitors that can also be utilized to report the air quality Index. State and local agencies should work with their EPA Regional office to best utilize available grant resources and consider such monitoring applications in each agencies annual monitoring network plan.	N	None
Reductions in redundant protocol and IMPROVE monitors with excess funds are better used to support other monitoring activities.	NACAA	EPA supports the elimination of redundant monitoring stations for reinvestment into high priority monitoring needs. While monitoring agencies can propose changes to their network in the annual monitoring network plan, a comprehensive approach would be best undertaken in the 5-year assessments. The next 5-year assessment is due to EPA from each State by July 1, 2010. The IMPROVE program undertook a comprehensive evaluation of the network in 2006. This evaluation identified a small number of redundant stations; however, data from these stations were being utilized for Regional transport analysis that would have been negatively impacted by a shift in resources. Monitoring agencies should consider their use of IMPROVE data and their need to track Regional haze in the 5-year assessments.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
EPA should provide adequate additional funding for the purchase and operation of low-volume PM10 monitors should the Agency include this requirement in its revision of the Lead NAAQS.	NACAA	Each recently revised NAAQS network design criteria will be incorporated into five-year assessments of the States' air quality surveillance system. EPA believes that the approved annual monitoring network plans and the five year assessments of the air quality surveillance system are the best way to prioritize which parts of each State's air monitoring program should be protected or reduced in scope to efficiently utilize the investment that EPA and the States make in air quality monitoring.	N	None
EPA is pushing new and often unproven technologies such as continuous PM2.5 federal equivalent methods and high sensitivity oxides of nitrogen (NOy), CO, and SO2 gas monitors. These technologies have a protracted development and implementation period and should be funded commensurately.	NACAA	EPA supports the field deployment of commercial ready ambient monitors into routine monitoring networks operated by State and local agencies. Such PM2.5 continuous and criteria pollutant gas analyzers have been in operation for decades with more recent improvements to provide improved detection limit, precision, and accuracy. Many State and local agencies have been successful in implementing these technologies. EPA has been working with State and local agencies to reinvest available grant resources for implementation of these technologies.	N	None
Recommend \$70 million for the Diesel Emission Reduction Act program (DERA) and that the funds be appropriated via other than the STAG account since not all recipients are state and local governments. [NACAA supports EPA's position not to limit the funds to only areas in non-attainment since many state and local agencies have active diesel emission reduction programs that reduce air toxics, greenhouse gases and haze.]	NACAA	The statute (the DERA portion of the Energy Act) specifies the grant programs' funding authorities and eligible entities. While the STAG appropriation was created primarily to convey funds for states, locals and tribes, it can be an avenue to fund other types of recipients per the direction of Congress. We surmise that, given the dynamic nature of the diesel programs, and that most funds would go to state and local entities, Congress found it appropriate to address the award of all DERA grants under the same appropriation account.	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
Region 6 questioned the DERA STAG level noted for FY 2008 in Table A-1.	Region 6	The \$59.1 million level in FY 2008 included an additional \$9.844M directed by Congress to address diesel issues in the San Joaquin Valley and South Coast, California AQMDs.	N	None
DERA is an important new initiative to reduce particulates and toxic emission impacts and improving public health. Such programs require additional funding and should not shortchange a state or local agency's existing air quality program. More funds should be added to the STAG level to fund DERA.	Michigan DEQ & City of Albuquerque	It is the Agency's understanding that Congress' funding of the DERA program was a determination made separately from funding decisions about the rest of the air programs covered under the STAG appropriation.	N	None
EPA should eliminate the requirement that local agencies that are not part of the state government be required to obtain the concurrence of their state's environmental commissioner and notify their EPA Regional Office before any agreeing to have any of their funds taken off-the-top to fund a co-regulator organization via a direct grant.	NACAA & Metro 4-SESARM	This Agency-wide Policy was announced by the Deputy Administrator in January 2007 and reflects the Agency's view that increased coordination and clarity across all levels of government regarding the use of STAG funds will result.	N	None
NACAA and SESARM do not agree with the Agency's decision to end the 'co-regulator' exception to competition for them and other multi-jurisdictional agencies since these organizations were expressly created by their member state and local agencies to assist them in carrying out their environmental and public health objectives.	NACAA & Metro 4-SESARM	The Agency's Competition Policy provides other avenues for multi-jurisdictional organizations to demonstrate and qualify for an exception from competition – e.g., the 'in the public interest' exception.	N	None
NACAA wishes to review OAR's administrative guidance for the §105 grant program before it is considered final. EPA Region 5 noted that the dates referenced for the document need to be updated.	NACAA, EPA Region 5	The Section 105 Administrative Guidance provides in one document, for the first time, a compilation and organization of all the various requirements affecting the administration of the section 105 grant program. As such it does not create new requirements and is intended primarily as a reference document for EPA Regional and HQ staff. However, OAR would be pleased to share this document with NACAA once it is final (expected in May 2008).	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
Urges EPA to take a flexible approach in the Agency's current efforts to design a national standard for grant work plans and state grant performance measures. EPA's current proposed approach to require only essential elements and a crosswalk to EPA's strategic architecture is a step in the right direction that will maintain state flexibility and still meet OMB concerns.	New England States	OAR is an active participant on the joint EPA-State workgroup and is encouraging an approach that meets the essential requirements of Part 35, OMB's expectations, and the need for flexibility on the part of state, local, and tribal air agencies.	N	None
Support increased funding for tribal air programs.	Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, & Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians	OAR appreciates the tribes' positions for increased funding for expanded tribal air program support. As part of a new initiative, OAR has requested an additional \$2.5M in FY 2009 in anticipation of increased tribal air quality work related to energy facility development.	N	None
Page 32. Even though the President's budget request may not be the final budget, it has been out since February, and there is no excuse for having "XXX's" instead of numbers in this Section.	Region 6	Yes, this was an editing error. The figures shown in Appendix A, Table 1 should also have been replicated on Page 32 of the technical portion of the guidance.	Y	Correct numbers are in the final guidance.
<b>Measures</b>				
Several comments on Appendix B performance measures for mobile sources and indoor environments.	Region 3	Agree	Y	Measures in Appendix B reflect HQ and Regional agreement.
The strategic targets outlined on page 7 of the NPM guidance do not align with the targets in Appendix B.	Region 5	Agree	N	The targets in Appendix are the annual targets for 2009 that make progress toward the longer-term strategic targets on page 7.



<b>Comment</b>	<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Change (Y, N, N/A)</b>	<b>Modification</b>
Appendix B, OTAQ 01b and 01c: Need to specify a time frame for retrofits and reductions.	Region 6	Agree. Reporting should occur at mid- and end-of-year (fiscal year).	N	No changes to Appendix B but frequency and other reporting instructions will be provided to the Regions.
CMAQ is not an EPA program. How can we require states and locals to report on a program that is not even ours?	Region 6	EPA Regional Offices (not state and local entities) report this data where the information is available.	N	Reporting instructions will be provided to the Regions.
OAP 1 should be removed from the ACS as a Regional commitment, since the system is controlled by HQ, not the Regions. We only repeat back the numbers that HQ sends us. In addition, the fiscal year reporting required for the benchmarking commitment (OAP1) is complicated by the fact that the program is a calendar year program and reports results in calendar year quarters, with several months lag time in reporting from HQs.	Region 6	To accommodate the differing needs and priorities of the Regions, we have changed all the OAP measures to non-commitment indicators.	Y	OAP 1, OAP 2, OAP 3, and OAP 4 modified to be non-commitment indicators with Regional reporting only and no Regional targets nor bidding.
N09, N10, and N11: If the target is expressed in percentages, then the measure should also be expressed in percentage, not "number of..."	Region 6	Agree	Y	Changed to percentage

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
<p>P06: We have already voiced concerns to the sublead regions and OAQPS on the National Guidance and the requirement to produce a Title V program audit report within 120 days of completing the audit. We strongly suggest that it be changed to 180 days.</p>	<p>Region 6</p>	<p>Measure P06 has a target of conducting program audits for 25% of State programs with more than 20 permits and producing a report within 120 days of completion of the audit. The 120 days is actually an increase from the original 90 days of a few years ago and the purpose and complexity of the program audits should not have changed since the number was increased. This measure is a title V measure and should be focused on the title V portion of the State program and not on the PSD/NSR portion of the program when the State used a merged approach. In addition, there are other Regions with States that have merged programs and don't seem to have an issue with the 120 days deadline. Increasing the deadline to 180 days (1/2 a year) does not seem to make sense as the measures are for one year and having 1/2 a year to complete one report seems in conflict with completing 25% of the programs per year. Finally, the 25% is a national target and could still be met if one or more Regions completed more than 25% of the audits and others completed less.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>P17: We have reviewed the ACS permit measures and really don't see a lot of change. The Regions have discussed and expressed their concerns about verification of percentage of timeliness on NSR permits as outlined in P17. We will need to stress to the States that this information will be verified. The States have a hard time understanding what this measure means when we negotiate it with them. They also believe it takes away from their resources to implement their programs. This is simply a measure that we need to attempt to verify how accurately the States are inputting.</p>	<p>Region 6</p>	<p>It is OAQPS's understanding that P17 reflects the result of the sub-lead measures process.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>None</p>

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
For OAQPS measures P08, P09, P20, and T07, suggest that the tribal-specific component of the measure be reported separately.	Region 4	Agree	N	No modification to measures. Will clarify in the reporting instructions.
OAQPS TR04 - Suggest clarifying that this measure refers to tribes that are funded by EPA to conduct monitoring.	Region 4	Disagree. The purpose of the measure is to track the extent of tribal participation and involvement in air quality monitoring activities, which in turn helps us gauge progress toward our goal of building tribal capacity.	N	None
The climate measures in Appendix B primarily focus almost exclusively on the Energy Star program(s). Given resource limitations and potential reluctance to avoid commitments not in the guidance, does OAR see any opportunity in emphasizing some of the other voluntary programs, such as Climate Leaders and Green Power Partnership, specifically with regard to states?	Region 5	We have added additional programs to the technical section of the guidance (as noted in the preceding response), but believe that the question of establishing related performance measures requires a broader discussion with Regions. The possibility of including performance measures for these programs areas will be a topic for discussion with the Regions during the FY 2010 measures development process.	N	None
<b>Other</b>				
Page 20: Spell out acronyms such as AMTIC, QAPP, PAMS, ARM, FEM, NPAP, and PEP that are used for the first time.	Region 5	Agree	Y	Spelled out acronyms on page 20.

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
We want to see more coordination between the Clean Air and Clean Water programs nationally at EPA to put initiatives and/or rules into place that are geared toward addressing multi-media issues such as eliminating fish consumption advisories due to mercury contamination and stemming acid and nutrient deposition from out-of-state sources.	New England States	<p>EPA's Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) and Office of Water (OW) are collaborating on two national-scale monitoring efforts that will provide critical information across multiple environmental media. 1) As part of EPA's National Lakes Survey, monitoring will include various surface water parameters in addition to sampling lake sediment for concentrations of mercury. The monitoring effort shall serve multiple purposes for EPA as well as other Agencies and States. The resulting data shall provide critical, nationally-distributed information about lake characteristics (e.g., pH, organic carbon, sulfate) that relate to mercury methylation and bioaccumulation potential. In addition, the data will allow for 'ground-truthing' deposition measurements and models for ecosystem sensitivity to mercury methylation.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
		<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>The sediment data can be used in conjunction with other measurement data (i.e., fish tissue mercury, and total and methyl mercury concentrations in surface water collected by the National Lakes Survey) to further our understanding of the ecological and distributional relations of mercury and methylmercury in the nations lakes. 2) OAR and OW are also collaborating on the National Rivers and Streams Assessment. Both OW and OAR share a common interest in gathering information on the distribution of mercury concentrations in fish species in these waters. This effort will also provide useful information to complement other monitoring efforts occurring across the States.</p>		

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
NACAA believes that the Performance Track program should be reevaluated and adjustments made (p 25).	NACAA	<p>NACAA recommends that Performance Track (PT) be reevaluated and adjustments made, and that PT should formally notice and seek comment on proposed incentives for program members.</p> <p>EPA would appreciate the opportunity to work with NACAA to address the issues raised. As PT has matured, new issues have arisen and opportunities emerged creating new challenges to its design and operation. In response, EPA has hosted two recent stakeholder meetings which and is actively exploring the formation of standing stakeholder subcommittee under the National Advisory Council on Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT). With respect to incentives, any regulatory benefits are delivered within the bounds of existing flexibility established within statute, regulation, or policy and in accordance with federal requirements related to formal notice and comment.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>	N	None

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
		<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>With respect to incentives for PT members, any regulatory benefits are developed in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act, which requires formal notice and comment. Delivery of benefits outside of PT-specific regulations, such as expedited permitting and alternative monitoring/reporting, is coordinated through the appropriate State environmental agencies as well as EPA Regional office. These non-PT regulatory benefits are delivered within the bounds of existing flexibility established within statute, regulation, or policy and, in fact, would be available to all facilities, regardless of whether they are PT members. EPA would appreciate the opportunity to work with NACAA in order to enhance the transparency of the program and increase public participation, particularly as related to these types of benefits.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>		

Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
		<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>NACAA also commented on PT's admission standards and the environmental goals set by PT members.</p> <p>EPA believes the standards for membership and retention are extremely rigorous; they were developed in consultation with EPA media programs and OECA, and State environmental agencies. With regard to environmental goals, member facilities are required to select goals that go above and beyond current environmental requirements and are encouraged to select goals in a "holistic fashion." A member's progress toward meeting its goals is monitored and reviewed annually, at a minimum, and more frequently as circumstances dictate.</p> <p>CONTINUED IN CELL BELOW</p>		
		<p>CONTINUED FROM CELL ABOVE</p> <p>NACAA's final comment related to compliance inspections at PT facilities. Currently, membership in PT designates a member facility as a "low priority for routine federal inspections." In reality, the federal inspections are only a fraction of the overall air compliance inspections conducted at member facilities. State and local environmental programs are free to set their own inspection priorities and frequencies. With regard to EPA's Compliance Monitoring Strategy (CMS), any deviation from the CMS such as changes inspection frequency must be approved by both the State and EPA Regional air program.</p>		



Comment	Commentor	Response	Change (Y, N, N/A)	Modification
The guidance should be worded so as not to trivialize the crucial role of state and local governments in relation to the federal role in maintaining air quality and protecting the public health.	NACAA & Region 6	There was no intention to trivialize the critical partnership role of state and local governments. The language has been modified to correct this perception.	Y	Language revised.